DOES MARKETING NEED REFORM?

Table of Contents

13. V. Kumar & Girish Ramani, “Interaction Orientation: The New Marketing Competency”
14. Glen Urban, “Customer Advocacy: The Start of a New Paradigm in Marketing?”
15. Faut Firat & Nik Dholakia, “Does Marketing Need to Transcend Modernism?”
16. Alladi Venkatesh & Lisa Penaloza, “From Marketing to the Market: A Call for Paradigm Shift”

Section 4: Adjusting to Marketing’s Changing Context

17. Phil Kotler, “Ethical Lapses of Marketers “
18. Kent Monroe & Lan Xia, “The Price is Unfair! Reforming Pricing Management”
19. David Wolfe, “Marketing to the New Customer Majority”
20. Tim Ambler, “Questions Marketers Need to Answer”
21. Jag Sheth & Raj Sisodia, “Marketing’s Final Frontier: The Automation of Consumption”
22. Pierre Berthon & Joby John, “The Marketing-IT Paradox: Interactions From the Customer’s Perspective”

Section 5: Marketing and its Stakeholders

23. Kay Lemon & Kathleen Seiders, “Making Marketing Accountable: A Broader View”
24. Russ Belk, “Out of Sight and Out of Our Mind: What of Those Left Behind by Globalism?”
25. Susan Douglas & C. Samuel Craig, “Expanding the Perspective: Making US Marketing Relevant for the New World Order”
26. Kerry Chipp, Scott Hoenig & Deon Nel, “What Can Industrializing Countries do to Avoid the Need for Marketing Reform?”

27. Anne Stringfellow & Sandy Jap, "Leveraging Marketing's Influence in Team and Group Settings"

Section 6: Academia, Heal Thyself: Reforming Marketing Scholarship & Education

28. Bill Wilkie, "The World of Marketing Thought: Where are we Heading?"
29. Gary Lilien, "Marketing: A Tale of Two Cities"
30. Rajiv Grover, "Marketing or Marketers: What or Who Needs Reforming?"
31. Jagmohan Raju, "Revitalizing the Role of Marketing in Business Organizations: What Can Poor Academics Do to Help?"
32. Morris Holbrook, "Does Marketing Need Reform School?"
33. Rajan Varadarajan, "Musings on the Need for Reform in Marketing"

Section 7: A New Mission for Marketing

34. Fred Webster, "Marketing: A Perpetual Work in Progress"
35. Len Berry & Ann Mirabito, "Recapturing Marketing's Mission"
36. Kevin Keller, "Holistic Marketing: A Broad, Integrated Perspective to Marketing Management"
37. Steve Grove, Joby John & Ray Fisk, "Back to the Future: Putting the People Back in Marketing"
38. John Farley & Praveen Kopalle, "Marketing Reform: A Meta-Analytic, Best Practice Frame for Using Marketing Metrics Effectively"
39. Steven Haeckel, "Designing a Business from the Customer Back"
40. Jag Sheth & Raj Sisodia, "How to Reform Marketing"

Chapter 1

Does Marketing Need Reform?

Jagdish N. Sheth & Rajendra S. Sisodia

Over thirty years ago, Peter Drucker wrote:

> Despite the emphasis on marketing and the marketing approach, marketing is still rhetoric rather than reality in far too many businesses. "Consumerism" proves this. For what consumerism demands of business is that it actually market. It demands that business start out with the needs, the realities, the values of the customer. It demands that business define its goal as the satisfaction of customer needs. It demands that business base its reward on its contribution to the customer. That after twenty years of marketing rhetoric consumerism could become a powerful popular movement proves that not much marketing has been practiced. Consumerism is the "shame of marketing."[1]

Drucker's characterization remains as true today as it ever was. Instead of acting as partners engaged in mutually rewarding co-destiny relationships, too many marketers and consumers continue to be locked into mistrustful, adversarial relationships in which there is a constant tug-of-war to determine which side can benefit disproportionately and unfairly.
It has been evident for many years that "marketing as usual" is simply not working any more, and that fundamentally new thinking is needed to revive and rejuvenate this most vital and

potentially noble of business functions—one that has, unfortunately, become the object of skepticism and distrust among many of its stakeholders.

Our own observations over the past decade or so have led us to conclude that marketing has been losing efficiency as well as effectiveness over time (Sheth & Sisodia 1995, 1996, 2002). In other words, marketing has been and continues to be in the throes of a productivity crisis. Other business functions (most dramatically, operations/manufacturing, but also many management support functions) have made striking advances in both efficiency and effectiveness, and have been able to "do more with less" year after year. Marketing, on the other hand, has managed to "do less with more," demanding and receiving more resources year after year, continually relying on a heavy dose of gimmicks and constant sales promotions, while delivering worse results: flat or declining customer satisfaction levels, shockingly low customer loyalty levels, and increasing numbers of alienated customers.

There was a time when marketing's current *modus operandi* worked, and worked rather well. It was a time when most customers were young, the rate of household formation was high, national brands were few, national distribution was limited, national media were just emerging, television was in its infancy, latent demand in many product categories was high, and producing products of reasonable quality at low cost was a challenge. None of those conditions prevail any more. Yet, for marketers and their increasingly irritated customers, it seems every day is *Groundhog Day*—recall the movie in which Bill Murray was condemned to relive the same day every day, without end. Or, as Yogi Berra would say, "Its déjà vu all over again."

Of course, marketing *has* added new things to its bag of tricks, such as pop-up ads (which make web surfing akin to duck shooting as users attempt to close windows faster than they appear) and a tidal wave of increasingly over the top and offensive email messages that fill "In

Boxes" to overflowing every morning. The problem is that marketing is too fixated on its bag of tricks. Many of those "tricks" were novel and may even have been interesting at one time, but they are anything but that today. Moreover, marketing's use of such tricks has increased geometrically as the Internet has greatly lowered the direct cost of dong so; more marketers than ever before are able to use these tricks with ever greater frequency, casting ever wider nets in the hope of catching a few unwary customers.

The "side effects" of marketing today overwhelm its intended "main effects." It seems that the more a customer is "marketed to," the more frustrated and irritated he or she becomes, and the more manipulated and helpless he or she feels. This is clearly no way to win customers and influence CEOs. Noise pollution, information overload, empty promises, outright exaggerations—marketing's negative effects on society have never been more pronounced.

It does not have to be this way. Sound marketing practices lead to low marketing costs coupled with highly satisfied customers, minimal spillover of marketing communication to groups outside the target market, long-term co-destiny relationships between companies and their customers, a strong emotional bond between companies and customers. Unfortunately, these have become the rare exception rather than the rule.

The harsh reality facing marketers today is that their bag of tricks has become a useless, even dangerous relic of a bygone era. The power in the marketplace—economic, informational and psychological—has shifted to customers. Old-style marketers have themselves become sitting ducks now, and information-savvy customers can—and do—readily exploit them to their own advantage.

Marketing: The Good, the Bad & the Ugly

Marketing practice today is rife with three major types of problems, as depicted in the figure. First, many marketing actions are either exploitative or downright unethical; in those cases, the marketer seeks to benefit by taking unfair advantage of the customer. Second, some marketing actions are so poorly thought out that they leave the company vulnerable to being exploited by increasingly deal-savvy consumers. We refer to these as “Dumb Marketing.” The third category of marketing actions is those that benefit neither customers not companies, and can only be characterized as utterly wasteful. In some cases (as with advertising so heavily as to induce a backlash against the brand), increased marketing spending not only does no good, it actually harms the company! Anheuser-Busch and Campbell Soup discovered this years ago after conducting numerous advertising experiments (Ackoff & Emshoff 1975, Eastlack & Rao 1989).

Collectively, these three types of actions represent the misalignment of marketing—and ultimately, all of them are dumb as well as wasteful. As the figure shows, any benefits accruing to marketers or customers at the expense of each other are short-lived at best, and usually lead to subsequent losses that more than offset previous gains.

So why is this happening, nearly half a century after the “marketing concept” became an integral part of the business vocabulary? Marketing is *supposed* to be about aligning company and customer interests. Practiced properly, it should result in happy, loyal customers, motivated and fulfilled employees and satisfied shareholders. The norm, however, is quite different. Marketing has become synonymous with hype, gimmickry, and the primacy of image over substance; marketers at many companies wittingly or unwittingly end up exploiting their own customers or becoming exploited by them. Marketing swallows up huge resources—the financial resources of companies as well as the time, attention and efforts of customers—while too often delivering little of value to either side in return. All chickens do eventually come home to roost, and the internal and external consequences of unethical, dumb and wasteful marketing cannot be escaped forever. Marketing managers must alter their business practices before their companies go out of business or are forced to reform by the heavy hand of regulation. Marketing has become addicted to these unethical, dumb and wasteful practices. Like any addict, it needs an intervention to break the addiction.

Marketing's current problems are rooted in organizational inertia, misaligned incentive systems, poorly designed value propositions and outmoded ways of thinking about markets and customers. The culture of marketing, especially in consumer marketing, has become too corrupted and disfigured by short-term thinking and a loss of focus on the fundamental human values that require that companies and customers treat each other as allies and partners in value creation rather than as adversaries and potential victims.

The Bad: Unethical Marketing

To achieve their sales and market share goals, more and more companies are resorting to exploitative and unethical marketing practices. Unethical marketing is that in which the marketer attempts to mislead, misinform or otherwise take unfair advantage of customers, and/or knowingly engages in activities that have a harmful effect on society. In these cases, marketers seek to benefit at the expense of customers rather than *with* them.

Too many companies try to exploit customer emotions, trust, confusion, lack of organization or lack of knowledge. Companies take advantage of vulnerable customers such as children, the elderly and the indigent. They convey a false sense of objectivity in their advertising, engage in opportunistic pricing or price gouging, push harmful or unnecessary products, make it difficult for unhappy customers to leave them, create and exploit customer addictions, pressure customers into making hasty decisions or unduly influence trusted advisors (such as pharmacists and doctors) to give customers poor advice.

Such “hit-and-run” marketing is so widespread that it sometimes appears to be the norm rather than the exception. Some examples are egregious, others somewhat subtle. Three prominent ones are: brazenly misleading advertisements (e.g. weight loss products), manipulative sales tactics (e.g., automobile retailing) and most forms of multilevel marketing. Telemarketing has earned a deservedly terrible reputation as the last refuge of “hit and run” marketers, and is estimated to result in over $50 billion of consumer fraud annually. Other frequently criticized practices include price gouging (e.g., ink cartridges for printers), advertising to children and many pharmaceutical marketing practices.

Unethical marketing may appear to pay off in the short run, but its long-term consequences can be deadly. There are many examples of highly successful companies demonstrating very high standards of marketing ethics. Ethical marketing is financially beneficial in the long run, as it builds customer trust. It is also essential to building employee morale and loyalty, which are prerequisites to delivering superior customers service and customer satisfaction.

The Ugly: Dumb Marketing

Many marketing practices are detrimental to the long-run interests of the marketer, but may offer customers a (usually) temporary benefit. These situations need not involve scams or illegal activities on the part of customers. Rather, they occur when shrewd customers, behaving quite reasonably and rationally, respond to poorly conceived and implemented (i.e. dumb) offers from marketers. For example:

- Some companies indiscriminately try to "buy" customers, as the major long distance companies did in the 1990s, leading many customers to switch providers repeatedly to take advantage of the incentives. The net result was the destruction of brand loyalty in the industry.
- Many customers "cherry pick" only deeply discounted "Sale" items from retail stores, resulting in a loss for the retailer every time they shop at the store.
- Many marketers use coupons in such a broad, untargeted manner that even those customers who would have readily bought the product at regular price receive a windfall. Traditional coupons are also highly susceptible to fraud by some retailers.
- Retailers that run constant sales (e.g. Sears usually has three "sales" every week) or make patently false claims (e.g. advertising "lowest prices of the year" every week) erode their own credibility while rendering the notion of "regular" price meaningless—and spend a great deal of money doing so.
- Blindly copying competitors' marketing tactics without assessing the full long-term impact of doing so.
- Expensive catalogs that go straight into the garbage can.
- Return policies that allow customers to repeatedly purchase and return products for no good reason and without consequences.

- Dumb pricing, as in the airline business, which has totally divorced price from value in setting prices for business versus consumer travel.
- End-of-quarter deals in business-to-business marketing, which cause savvy customers to wait until the end of a quarter to get advantageous terms.

Dumb marketing is not just noisy and annoying; it is very costly to the bottom line and thus detrimental to employees and shareholders, while doing little of ultimate consequence for customers. It is usually motivated by extreme short-term thinking on the part of marketers (e.g., to "make" their quarterly numbers) or to cover up for previous mistakes (e.g., end-of-season clearances on merchandize that customers do not want).

Smart marketers must deal with customers who behave in an unethical way towards them. Some consumers are egregious, habitual and serial offenders. In most cases, these customers face no repercussions at all; for example, consumers continue abusing some companies' generous return/exchange policies indefinitely. Even if a company eventually detects a pattern and refuses to do business with certain customers (something that rarely happens), such customers can simply start exploiting another company. In doing so, they start with a clean slate, carrying no taint from their previous rejection.

Companies need to be able to identify and "tag" those consumers who:

- Repeatedly buy and return merchandize, especially apparel, after obviously using the merchandize.
- Use multiple names or variations on names in order to qualify for promotional offers multiple times (such as with music and book clubs).

- Habitually make false complaints about customer service in order to get companies to offer them free goods.
- Threaten companies with negative publicity if their (unreasonable) demands are not met.
- Have been verbally or otherwise abusive towards employees.
- Engage in other unacceptable practices such as software piracy, price tag switching, repeatedly claiming credit card stolen etc.

The Bad <u>and</u> Ugly: Wasteful Marketing

In an age when the mantra of business has been "do more with less," the marketing function has for too long being "doing less with more." In most industries today, the marketing function consumes over 50% of corporate resources, up from less than 25% around 1950.

At the macro level, marketing represents a tremendous waste of resources that could be better utilized elsewhere. In the US, companies spend approximately $11,000 per year per family of five on advertising and sales promotion alone. Does all this marketing spending create incremental value, or does it just influence consumer choice behavior in ways that may as often as not be value decreasers? How much of it fails to do even that? (Out of the 1500 or so advertising messages each person is exposed to daily, how many actually have any impact on attitudes and/or behavior?) There is strong evidence that as much as 80% of that money is wasted or misspent in some way. For example, most sales promotions are so poorly designed and targeted that they achieve redemption rates of 1-2% or less, and most of those redeeming are not the ones that the company needs to target. Research clearly shows that many large companies waste billions of dollars on unnecessary and poorly conceived advertising. Most customer loyalty programs don't work; to the contrary, they create customers who are more mercenary than ever.

Some more evidence that marketers are spending resources poorly:

- AdWorks 2, a study conducted by MMA and IRI in conjunction with Nielsen Media Research found that television advertising returned only 32 cents for every dollar invested.[2]
- Roper Starch reports that consumer cynicism and distrust of advertising is growing. Consumers are "tuning out, turning off, and opting out."[3]
- Advertising agency loyalty has declined sharply as client companies look for quick fixes to their advertising woes; the average number of years that clients retain the same agency has declined from 11 years to only two-and-a-half, according to an October 2001 survey by consulting firm Pile & Co.
- A 1995 study by Information Resources, Inc. found that 70-80% of new product introductions fail, with the average failure resulting in a net loss of up to $25 million.
- Direct marketing response rates have been falling precipitously; for example, according to BAI Global, the response rates for credit-card marketers have declined steadily, from 2.8 percent in 1992 to an all-time low of 0.6% in 2000.[4]
- Email marketing, one of the newer weapons in the marketer's arsenal, is fast losing its effectiveness; as its use and abuse have soared, response rates over the past five years have fallen from as high as 30% to less than 2%, and in the most egregious cases of blatant "spamming," a fraction of 1%.

Nothing Exceeds Like Excess

“Overmarketing” is the cause of many of marketing’s problems, and the reason for the backlash against many companies and industries, e.g. the drug industry. Many companies over-advertise, even more over-promote; for example, Abraham and Lodish (1990) found that 86% of sales promotions lose money. Many companies over-sell, using pushy tactics, over-claiming benefits and targeting people who should not be targeted, such as with erectile dysfunction drugs.

Overmarketing coarsens life—too much of anything is bad. If companies could eliminate dumb, wasteful and unethical marketing, how much would be left? What would be the impact? On consumers? On companies? On society? On national competitiveness? We think there would a significant positive impact on each of these.

Marketing, in the aggregate, does benefit the economy; the evidence is pretty strong that societies with high levels of marketing activity have been more productive than societies that did not permit marketing. But more is not necessarily better. Marketing cannot be given a blank check, any more than any other socially useful activity.

Some of the reasons for overspending on marketing are:

- Incremental thinking and marginal analysis
- Short-term thinking—ignoring long-term negative impacts
- Defensive mindsets—irrational fear of competitors
- Continued obsession with conquest sales when the reality is that the business will ultimately prosper only if it can keep existing customers
- Lack of faith in value proposition
- Low hurdles for spending effectiveness
- Dysfunctional budgeting—the “use it or lose it” mindset
- Ignoring overflow effects of excessive marketing on non-customers—poisoning the well

- Trying harder instead of trying smarter—overspending in one area (e.g. advertising) to compensate for a vulnerability in another (e.g. poor product quality)

Many marketers are locked into a "mutually assured distraction" (MAD) arms race with their customers. The more customers resist and are able to block marketing efforts, the more these marketers seek to redouble those efforts. To change this MAD pattern, they must change the paradigm—or their mental models, as Jerry Wind suggests in an essay in this volume. At the company level, marketing's job should be to make itself gradually less needed over the life of a product, as awareness and "ever tried" levels rise. In that sense, a good marketer is like a good doctor, who does not make the patient dependent on him or her for continued good health.

Conclusion

Must marketing always elicit negative sentiments? Is there something intrinsic to marketing that regardless of how hard we try, consumers are going to resist it? We don't think so. There are many companies that, in fact, are very well liked and even loved by their customers and other stakeholders. These companies show that it is possible to do a lot more with a lot less. We have studied 35 such exemplary marketing companies that, almost without exception, spend much less than their industry peers on marketing, yet have much more satisfied customers. The companies featured in our forthcoming book (*Firms of Endearment*, Wharton Publishing, 2006) have happier employees, suppliers, communities and investors as well.

It ultimately comes down to a company's attitude towards its customers and how well it serves them. One of the companies we have studied is Google. Without spending a dollar on advertising, Google has become the most valuable brand in the world, according to Interbrand.

Everything that Google does is demonstrably in the best interests of its customers. It blocks pop-up ads. It will not take a company's money if its ad is not drawing any response. Advertisers can only earn the top position through clickthroughs, not by paying more. So, only the most relevant messages move up that chain because the company views advertising as a service to its customers and not as an intrusion or something that exists merely to subsidize the company's free search service. Or consider Jordan's Furniture, a highly successful regional furniture retailer in the Northeast. The average furniture retailer spends approximately 7% of gross revenue on marketing and advertising, Jordan's spends only 2%. Despite this, it is by far the best known and successful company in the business. It turns its inventory over 13 times a year, compared 1-2 times for most furniture retailers. It never has sales; with a philosophy of "underprices" (every day fair prices), it generates sales of almost $1000 per square foot, compared to the industry average of $100-200. The company equates retailing with entertainment, has well paid, highly motivated and loyal employees, and is a beloved member of its community, receiving dozens of awards for its work.

So there appears to be no correlation between marketing spending and customer happiness with a company, or necessarily between marketing spending and the creation of valuable marketing assets. When it comes to marketing, it is a matter of doing it right and doing it at the right volume level. Or, as Drucker would say, do the right things and do them right. What matters is not the quantity of marketing dollars spent, but the quality of the marketing thinking that pervades decision making in companies.

All marketers must strive for exemplary marketing, which is effective, efficient and ethical. They must figure out how to align the interests of the company with those of its customers, so that they do not have to expend all of their energies getting customers to do things that are ultimately not in their best interest. To achieve this, they will have to shift their priorities and redirect their energies. Marketing has become almost exclusively about representing the company to the customer, putting a positive spin on everything the company does. It needs to be primarily about representing the customer to the company. Marketers need to achieve deep empathy and emotional understanding of their customers, and then translate that knowledge into company actions that will improve their customers' quality of life. Marketing is a powerful force, backed up by huge resources. It must be entrusted only to those with the wisdom to use it well.

Restoring Marketing Virtues, or Kinder, Gentler Marketing

To conclude, we would like to quote Martin Luther King, Jr., who said, "We must pursue peaceful ends through peaceful means." This sentiment applies to marketing as well. Forget all the old ideas about marketing warfare, customer conquest and capture, "aggressive" marketing tactics of any kind. Indeed, aggressive sentiments and mindsets have no place in marketing. Marketing must be about pursuing desirable ends (delighted customers, undamaged societal interests, fair returns to shareholders) through desirable means. The values of the marketing profession must embrace seemingly forgotten but timeless virtues such as:

- Truth: "Marketing" and "truth" have become words you cannot use in the same sentence; this has to change. If marketing is ever to gain a measure of credibility, the phrase "truthful marketing" cannot be an oxymoron any more.
- Integrity: Companies are becoming painfully aware of the need for uncompromising integrity in their dealings with the financial community, yet many continue to show little concern for maintaining the same standard of integrity in their dealings with customers.

- Authenticity: Many marketing communications are intended to appear as though they are personalized. Of course, the vast majority of customers see right through this façade. Customers can innately sense the human presence (or lack thereof) behind marketing communications. Marketing must strive for authenticity in all customer dealings.
- Trust: This is probably the one virtue that is most lacking in the relationship between companies and their customers. Without mutual trust, it is a joke to speak of "relationship marketing," and an egregious waste to spend hundreds of millions of dollars on "customer relationship management" systems, as many companies have done in recent years to little effect.
- Respect: The legendary advertising executive David Ogilvy wrote, "The customer is not an idiot, she is your wife." Many marketers have indeed been guilty of treating their customers as idiots. Marketers must give respect in order to earn respect. They must respect their customers, of course, but they must also respect their suppliers and even their competitors.
- Reciprocal empathy and vulnerability: To maximize goodwill, marketers and customers must empathize with one another, and both must be (or make themselves) equally vulnerable.
- True dialogue: Most companies are very good (or so they think) at speaking to their customers, but exceedingly few are any good at truly listening to them. Without listening, there is no learning and certainly no relationship.
- Manners: Marketing is rarely polite or deferential; instead, it is usually loud, boorish, in-your-face, insensitive. Marketers constantly interrupt customers' lives with their incessant communications. Marketers routinely bad mouth their competitors, and insult the intelligence of their customers—hardly the sort of behavior that comprises civilized discourse.

- Forgiveness: Marketers must ask customers for forgiveness, given their past trespasses and indiscretions. Over time, customers will learn to forgive marketers' occasional lapses and see them against the backdrop of overall good behavior. Otherwise, the friction between marketers and customers will remain, as the cartilage between them has worn thin after years of abuse.
- Courage and Patience: Changing decades-old practices will take courage, as marketers seek to counter conventional wisdom and the skepticism of colleagues. For example, it takes courage for a company to stop "over promising and under-delivering" (as is the norm) and actually start under-promising and over-delivering. It will also take patience; much like a down-on-its luck professional sports team must go through a painful rebuilding process, the marketing function will have to endure a lengthy adjustment period as it seeks to rebuild its reputation with customers and with other functional areas.
- Gratitude and Recognition: Marketers need to show their gratitude and appreciation to their customers, and also put in place mechanisms whereby customers can do the same for their best employees. Some airlines, for example, give their best customers employee appreciation vouchers, which they can hand out to exemplary employees.
- Humility: Marketing must shed its hubris and embrace humility. Consider the definition of the word hubris: *Exaggerated pride or self confidence, often resulting in retribution; overbearing presumption; arrogance.* These words fit traditional marketing like a glove.
- By adopting a customer-centric perspective, marketing professional can make marketing a positive force in the quality of life of consumers, instead of the nuisance it is often perceived to be.

References

Abraham, Magid M. & Leonard M. Lodish (1990), “Getting the Most Out of Advertising and Promotion,” *Harvard Business Review* (May-June).

Ackoff, Russell L. & James R. Emshoff (1975), “Advertising Research at Anheuser-Busch, Inc. (1963-1968),” *Sloan Management Review*, Winter.

Eastlack Joseph O. Jr. & Ambar G. Rao (1989), “Advertising Experiments at the Campbell Soup Company," *Marketing Science* 8 (1), pp. 57-71.

Sheth, Jagdish N. and Rajendra S. Sisodia (1996), “Feeling the Heat: Making Marketing More Productive,” Part II, *Marketing Management*, Vol.4, No. 3 (Winter), pp. 19-33.

Sheth, Jagdish N. and Rajendra S. Sisodia (1995), “Feeling the Heat: Making Marketing More Productive,” Part I, *Marketing Management*, Vol.4, No. 2 (Fall), pp. 8-23.

Sheth, Jagdish N. and Rajendra S. Sisodia (2002), “Marketing Productivity: Conceptualization, Measurement and Improvement” *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 55, No. 5 (May), pp. 349-362.

Section 1: Mirror, Mirror on the Wall: Marketing's Image, Excess and Resistance Problems

Marketing faces three fundamental problems: it suffers from a poor image with consumers as well as with business professionals; everything about it seems to run to excess, and it is now encountering serious resistance from consumers. The papers in this section address these problems, as well as provide some possible solutions.

Marketing as an institution has been always been under critical surveillance due to its close association with selling, persuasion, and the profit motive. It has, however, invited further criticism recently due to the macro trends of globalization, market-driven government policies (especially after the collapse of communism), and the emergence of the Internet. The Internet is both a richer medium and has greater reach than other mass media. It is a powerful, affordable and universal medium of information, communication and transaction that has enabled new and innovative marketing approaches that neither society nor consumers could imagine.

In our first essay, J. Walker Smith, President of Yankelovich Partners, presents results of a groundbreaking Monitor Omniplus study that examined marketing from a consumer perspective. In other words, what do consumers think of today's marketing practices? Overwhelmingly, 60 percent agreed that their opinion of advertising and marketing had become more negative today than just a few years ago. 61 percent said that the amount of marketing and advertising had gotten out of control. Even worse, 45 percent said that the amount of marketing they are exposed to detracts from their experiences of everyday life. The Yankelovich study also found that the negative perception of marketing held by consumers was not reflected in their survey of marketing directors at well known companies. Smith believes that this lack of concurrence between consumers and marketers, unless corrected soon, will encourage consumers to be even more resistant to marketing.

A study carried out by Sheth, Sisodia and Barbulescu also provided similar results about the image of marketing. Using the framework of "tragedy of the commons," the authors suggest that over-utilization of the same marketing tactics and tools by everyone seems to be the underlying reason for the negative image of marketing. This is especially true with respect to telemarketing, junk mail, and pop-up advertising. At the same time, consumers do enjoy free samples and Super Bowl ads. In fact, most of them look forward to them with positive anticipation. It seems that the easier and cheaper it is for a marketing tactic to be executed, the more "junk-like" it becomes in the eyes of consumers. This suggests that a way of alleviating this problem would be to raise the cost of marketing approaches such as spam and junk mail.

Finally, the authors also found some significant gaps in the perception of marketing as a business function between marketing professionals and non-marketing professionals. While both agree that marketing is a real value-added function, the role of marketing was perceived to be more limited by non-marketing than marketing professionals.

Johny Johansson's essay, based on his provocative book *In Your Face: How American Marketing Excess Fuels Anti-Americanism*, suggests that American marketing is morally bankrupt, and that American marketing practices have helped turn the American way of life into its lowest common denominator in terms of quality of life. According to him, we marketers encourage several vices, such as excessive spending, outrageous behavior and the unmitigated pursuance of individual gratification. We do this because we have the marketing tools to do it, the companies have the financial muscle to do it and competition gives us a justification for doing it. Johansson then supports his argument about the emergence of the lowest common denominator in products (fast foods, SUVs), in promotions (loud and aggressive, instill a "must have" feeling), and in communications media (pop-up ads, cell phone telemarketing and email spam). He strongly believes that this American approach to marketing is fueling anti-American sentiments worldwide, as American consumer marketing expands on a global basis. His recommendation is to instill moral responsibility among marketing practitioners and academics.

The final paper in this section by Malhotra, Wu and Allvine provides thoughtful and empirically-based evidence of what Johansson and others have anecdotally asserted. There is clear evidence of excessive buying in America as evidenced by low savings rate, mounting credit card debt and all time high personal bankruptcies. The authors attribute such marketing practices to easy access to credit cards (more recently debit cards) and the lure of advertising and sales promotions. They suggest that we need to redefine the role of marketing in society and that marketing practices should be limited to satisfying consumers' needs that are existent and affordable, rather than creating needs that are unhealthy or unaffordable. In other words, marketing should not convert want into needs.

Notes

[1] Peter F. Drucker, *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices,* New York: Harper & Row, 1973.

[2] Erwin Ephron, "Are Half of All Ad Dollars Wasted? *Mediaweek,* September 8, 2003.Vol.13, Iss. 32; pg. 22.

[3] Tara Parker-Pope, "Consumers Believe Advertising Misleads, Exaggerates Products—Most Say They Are Skeptical Of Industry's Hard Sell, World-Wide Survey Finds," *The Wall Street Journal*, July 14, 1995. pg. C1.

[4] http://www.salesoverlays.com/Big%20Waves%20bring%20Big%20Business%20Summit.pdf